APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/671,407	09/25/2003	Cary Lee Bates	ROC920030265US1	8399

30206 7590 12/21/2006	EXAMINER
IBM CORPORATION	VUU, HENRY
ROCHESTER IP LAW DEPT. 917	
3605 HIGHWAY 52 NORTH	ART UNIT / PAPER NUMBER
ROCHESTER, MN 55901-7829	2179

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	12/21/2006	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/671,407	BATES ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Henry Vuu	2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *25 September 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *25 September 2003* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 11- 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 11 – 15 claims a "signal-bearing medium" encoded with instructions, wherein the signal-bearing medium includes non-statutory media, such as wireless communication mediums as described in Applicant's specification (see e.g., page 10 of Specification, lines 3 – 5). Applicant's specification further teaches signal-bearing media are not limited to non-rewritable storage medium, and rewritable storage mediums (see e.g., page. 9 of Specification, lines 22 – 24), which therefore encompasses carrier waves, transmission signals, or the like.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention lacks assured results and therefore is not concrete. Depending on the remainder of the claim, it may also not be tied to a technological art, environment or machines, instead being an abstract idea, and not tangible, as well.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1 – 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Horstmann et al. (Patent No. 5,995,099).

As to independent claim 1, Horstmann et al. teaches:

A method comprising: finding a first link in a first page (see e.g., col. 6, lines 48 – 50; i.e., links software fetches the first link in a first page) to a reciprocal site (see e.g., col. 3, lines 40 – 42; i.e., the first link corresponds to a link to a reciprocal site); determining a reciprocal page based on the first link (see e.g., col. 6, lines 58 – 61; i.e., the links software exercises the first link to determine if a reciprocal page exists); and determining whether a reciprocal link exists in the reciprocal page to the first page (see e.g., col. 6, lines 50 – 61; i.e., the links software checks the reciprocal link on the reciprocal page to determine if the reciprocal link points back to the first page).

As to dependent claim 2, Horstmann et al. teaches:

The method of claim 1, further comprising: if the reciprocal link does not exist (see e.g., col. 6, line 52), issuing a warning (see e.g., col. 6, lines 53 – 55; i.e., the warning message corresponds to the links software sending an e-mail message to the owner).

As to dependent claim 3, Horstmann et al. teaches:

The method of claim 1, further comprising: if the reciprocal link does not exist, removing the first link from the first page (see e.g., col. 6, lines 55 – 56; i.e., the e-mail message identifies to the owner the defective link in the first page and notifies the owner that the link is being deleted).

As to dependent claim 4, Horstmann et al. teaches:

The method of claim 1, wherein the finding further comprises: finding at least one

reciprocal tag (see e.g., Microsoft Computer Dictionary 5th edition, page 260 – 261; i.e.,

a hyperlink, such as a reciprocal link, is defined as "A connection between an element in

hypertext document, such as a word, a phrase, a symbol, or an image, and a different

element in the document, another document, a file or a script. The user activates the

link by clicking on the linked element, which is usually underlined or in a color different

from the rest of the document to indicate that the element is linked. Hyperlinks are

indicated in a hypertext document through tags in markup languages such as SGML

and HTML.") in the first page (see e.g., col. 6, lines 48 – 50; i.e., links software fetches a

reciprocal link in a first page, wherein those skilled in the art will appreciate that in order

for the links software to fetch a reciprocal link among a plurality of links, the links

software must be able to distinguish a reciprocal tag from other link tags), wherein the at

least one reciprocal tag identifies the first link (see e.g., col. 3, lines 40 – 42; i.e., the first

link corresponds to a link to a reciprocal site, wherein the first link has a reciprocal tag

pointing to a reciprocal site).

As to dependent claim 5, Horstmann et al. teaches:

The method of claim 4, wherein the determining the reciprocal page (see e.g., col. 6,

lines 58 – 61; i.e., the links software exercises the first link to determine if a reciprocal

page exists) further comprises: finding a return link to the reciprocal page based on the

at least one reciprocal tag (see e.g., col. 6, lines 58 – 61; i.e., the links software inspects

a link and verifies the existence of a back link associated with the link being inspected).

As to independent claim 6, Horstmann et al. teaches:

An apparatus comprising: means for finding at least one reciprocal tag (see e.g.,

Microsoft Computer Dictionary 5th edition, page 260 – 261; i.e., a hyperlink, such as a

reciprocal link, is defined as "A connection between an element in hypertext document,

such as a word, a phrase, a symbol, or an image, and a different element in the

document, another document, a file or a script. The user activates the link by clicking on

the linked element, which is usually underlined or in a color different from the rest of the

document to indicate that the element is linked. Hyperlinks are indicated in a hypertext

document through tags in markup languages such as SGML and HTML.") in a first page

(see e.g., col. 6, lines 48 – 50; i.e., links software fetches a reciprocal link in a first page,

wherein those skilled in the art will appreciate that in order for the link software to fetch

a reciprocal link among a plurality of links, the link software must be able to distinguish a

reciprocal tag from other link tags), wherein the at least one reciprocal tag is associated

with a first link (see e.g., col. 6, lines 48 – 50; i.e., the reciprocal tag corresponds to the

first link) to a reciprocal site (see e.g., co. 6, lines 58 – 61; i.e., the link software verifies

that the first link points to an existing page and if the existing page contains a back link,

wherein the existing page corresponds to the reciprocal site); means for finding a

reciprocal page (see e.g., col. 6, lines 48 – 50) based on the at least one reciprocal tag

(see e.g., col. 6, lines 48 – 50; i.e., the reciprocal tag corresponds to the first link,

wherein the links software fetches the first link), wherein the reciprocal page is at the

reciprocal site (see e.g., col. 1, lines 60 – 66); and means for determining whether a

reciprocal link exists in the reciprocal page to the first page (see e.g., col. 6, lines 48 –

61; i.e., the link software fetches a first link by locating a reciprocal tag, exercises the

first link, and determines if the reciprocal site contains a back link associated with the first page).

As to dependent claim 7, claim 7 differs from claim 2 only in that claim 7 is an apparatus claim using a computer readable medium (see e.g., col. 8, line 27; i.e., memory 865) containing executable instructions (see e.g., col. 8, line 28; i.e., link software) when executed (see e.g., col. 8, lines 35 – 36; i.e., executes on workstation) causes a processor (see e.g., col. 8, lines 35 – 36; i.e., workstation) to perform the steps of claim 2. Thus, claim 7 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 2, and are respectfully rejected along the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 8, claim 8 differs from claim 3 only in that claim 8 is an apparatus claim using a computer readable medium (see e.g., col. 8, line 27; i.e., memory 865) containing executable instructions (see e.g., col. 8, line 28; i.e., link software) when executed (see e.g., col. 8, lines 35 – 36; i.e., executes on workstation) causes a processor (see e.g., col. 8, lines 35 – 36; i.e., workstation) to perform the steps of claim 3. Thus, claim 8 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 3, and are respectfully rejected along the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 9, Horstmann et al. teaches:
The apparatus of claim 6, further comprising: means for removing the first link from the first page if the reciprocal link does not exist (see e.g., col. 6, lines 50 – 56; i.e., the e-mail message identifies to the owner the defective link in the first page and notifies the owner that the link is being deleted) and a number of times the reciprocal link has not

existed exceeds a threshold (see e.g., col. 7, lines 36 – 38; i.e., if a link is not selected

for a predetermined of time, the link is deleted from the page).

As to dependent claim 10, Horstmann et al. teaches:

The apparatus of claim 6, further comprising: means for adding the at least one

reciprocal tag to the first page based on a selected section of the first page (see e.g.,

col. 6m lines 4 – 11; i.e., the user is able to edit the first page by adding topic sections

and dividing various links under appropriate headings), wherein the first link is in the

selected section (see e.g., col. 6, lines 18 – 22).

As to independent claim 11, Horstmann et al. teaches:

A signal-bearing medium encoded with instructions (see e.g., col. 6, line 49 and col. 9;

i.e., link software), wherein the instructions when executed comprise (see e.g., col. 8,

lines 31 – 42): adding at least one reciprocal tag to a first page based on a selected

section of the first page (see e.g., col. 6m lines 4 – 11; i.e., the user is able to edit the

first page by adding topic sections and dividing various links under appropriate

headings), wherein a first link to a reciprocal site is in the selected section (see e.g., col.

6, lines 18 – 22); finding the at least one reciprocal tag in the first page (see e.g., col. 6,

lines 48 – 50; i.e., the link software fetches the first link, wherein the first link includes a

unique tag for the link software to identify) in response to a request to publish the first

page (see e.g., col. 6, lines 12 – 21; i.e., the user is able to edit the link page by adding

links, wherein the link software exercises the newly added links to determine if

reciprocal links are found on reciprocal pages associated with the links); finding a

reciprocal page based (see e.g., col. 6, lines 50 – 52; i.e., the link software exercises

the link to ensure a reciprocal page exists) on the finding the at least one reciprocal tag (see e.g., col. 6, lines 48 – 50; i.e., the reciprocal tag corresponds to the first link, wherein the links software fetches the first link), wherein the reciprocal page is at the reciprocal site (see e.g., col. 1, lines 60 – 66; dedicated link pages that contain a list of links to other sites); and determining whether a reciprocal link exists in the reciprocal page to the first page (see e.g., col. 6, lines 58 – 61; i.e., the link software exercises the link to determine if a corresponding page exists, wherein further determination includes if the corresponding webpage includes a back link).

As to dependent claim 12, claim 12 differs from claim 2 only in that claim 12 is an apparatus claim using a computer readable medium (see e.g., col. 8, line 27; i.e., memory 865) containing executable instructions (see e.g., col. 8, line 28; i.e., link software) when executed (see e.g., col. 8, lines 35 – 36; i.e., executes on workstation) causes a processor (see e.g., col. 8, lines 35 – 36; i.e., workstation) to perform the steps of claim 2. Thus, claim 12 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 2, and are respectfully rejected along the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 13, claim 13 differs from claim 3 only in that claim 13 is an apparatus claim using a computer readable medium (see e.g., col. 8, line 27; i.e., memory 865) containing executable instructions (see e.g., col. 8, line 28; i.e., link software) when executed (see e.g., col. 8, lines 35 – 36; i.e., executes on workstation) causes a processor (see e.g., col. 8, lines 35 – 36; i.e., workstation) to perform the steps of claim 3. Thus, claim 13 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 3, and are respectfully rejected along the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 14, claim 14 differs from claim 9 only in that claim 14 is an apparatus claim using a computer readable medium (see e.g., col. 8, line 27; i.e., memory 865) containing executable (see e.g., col. 8, line 28; i.e., link software) when executed (see e.g., col. 8, lines 35 – 36; i.e., executes on workstation) causes a processor (see e.g., col. 8, lines 35 – 36; i.e., workstation) to perform the steps of claim 9. Thus, claim 14 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 9, and are respectfully rejected along the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 15, Horstmann et al. teaches:

The signal-bearing medium (see e.g., col. 6, line 49 and col. 9; i.e., link software) of claim 11, further comprising: removing the first link from the first page if the reciprocal link does not exist (see e.g., col. 6, lines 50 – 56; i.e., the e-mail message identifies to the owner the defective link in the first page and notifies the owner that the link is being deleted) and a length of time that the reciprocal link has not existed exceeds a threshold (see e.g., col. 7, lines 38 – 40; i.e., eliminating links that have not been selected for a predetermined time period).

As to independent claim 16, Horstmann et al. teaches:

A server (see e.g., col. 7, line 63; i.e., first server 805, second sever 810, and third server 815) comprising: a processor (see e.g., those skilled in the art would appreciate that first server 805, second sever 810, and third server 815 contains a processor for executing the link software); and a storage device encoded (see e.g., col. 8, line 27; i.e., memory 865) with instructions (see e.g., col. 8, line 28; i.e., link software), wherein the instructions when executed on the processor (see e.g., col. 8, lines 35 – 36; i.e.,

executes on workstation) comprise: adding at least one reciprocal tag to a first page

based on a selected section of the first page (see e.g., col. 6m lines 4 – 11; i.e., the user

is able to edit the first page by adding topic sections and dividing various links under

appropriate headings), wherein a first link to a reciprocal site is in the selected section

(see e.g., col. 6, lines 18 – 22), finding the at least one reciprocal tag in the first page

(see e.g., col. 6, lines 48 – 50; i.e., the link software fetches the first link, wherein the

first link includes a unique tag for the link software to identify), finding a reciprocal page

based (see e.g., col. 6, lines 50 – 52; i.e., the link software exercises the link to ensure a

reciprocal page exists) on the at least one reciprocal tag (see e.g., col. 6, lines 48 – 50;

i.e., the reciprocal tag corresponds to the first link, wherein the links software fetches

the first link), wherein the reciprocal page is at the reciprocal site (see e.g., col. 1, lines

60 – 66; dedicated link pages that contain a list of links to other sites), determining

whether a reciprocal link exists in the reciprocal page to the first page (see e.g., col. 6,

lines 58 – 61; i.e., the link software exercises the link to determine if a corresponding

page exists, wherein further determination includes if the corresponding webpage

includes a back link), and if the reciprocal link does not exist (see e.g., col. 5, lines 37 –

42; i.e., in the even that a link back is not established), determining an action based on

a user-interface option (see e.g., col. 5, lines 35 – 53; i.e., if a link back is not

established, a "read only" mode or one-way link is added by specifying the action on

page 400).

As to dependent claim 17, claim 17 differs from claim 2 only in that claim 17 is an

apparatus claim using a computer readable medium (see e.g., col. 8, line 27; i.e.,

memory 865) containing executable instructions (see e.g., col. 8, line 28; i.e., link

software) when executed (see e.g., col. 8, lines 35 – 36; i.e., executes on workstation)

causes a processor (see e.g., col. 8, lines 35 – 36; i.e., workstation) to perform the

steps of claim 2. Thus, claim 17 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as

claimed in claim 2, and are respectfully rejected along the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 18, claim 18 differs from claim 3 only in that claim 18 is an

apparatus claim using a computer readable medium (see e.g., col. 8, line 27; i.e.,

memory 865) containing executable instructions (see e.g., col. 8, line 28; i.e., link

software) when executed (see e.g., col. 8, lines 35 – 36; i.e., executes on workstation)

causes a processor (see e.g., col. 8, lines 35 – 36; i.e., workstation) to perform the

steps of claim 3. Thus, claim 18 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as

claimed in claim 3, and are respectfully rejected along the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 19, claim 19 differs from claim 9 only in that claim 19 is an

apparatus claim using a computer readable medium (see e.g., col. 8, line 27; i.e.,

memory 865) containing executable instructions (see e.g., col. 8, line 28; i.e., link

software) when executed (see e.g., col. 8, lines 35 – 36; i.e., executes on workstation)

causes a processor (see e.g., col. 8, lines 35 – 36; i.e., workstation) to perform the

steps of claim 9. Thus, claim 19 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as

claimed in claim 9, and are respectfully rejected along the same rationale.

As to dependent claim 20, claim 20 differs from claim 15 only in that claim 20 is

an apparatus claim using a computer readable medium (see e.g., col. 8, line 27; i.e.,

memory 865) containing executable instructions (see e.g., col. 8, line 28; i.e., link

software) when executed (see e.g., col. 8, lines 35 – 36; i.e., executes on workstation)

causes a processor (see e.g., col. 8, lines 35 – 36; i.e., workstation) to perform the

steps of claim 15. Thus, claim 20 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as

claimed in claim 15, and are respectfully rejected along the same rationale.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure. Prior art Patent No. 5,761,683 can be applicable and pertinent to

applicant's disclosure. Prior art disclosed by Logan et al. teaches identifying link tags in

a Hyper Text Markup Language (HTML) document in order to change the

characteristics of the link, by either removing the link, disabling the link, adding a link, or

editing a link.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure. Prior art Publication No. 2002/0078095 can be applicable and

pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Prior art disclosed by Culham et al. teaches a

method of finding specific links among a plurality of links within a webpage by identifying

Hyper Text Markup Language (HTML) tags.

Inquires

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Henry Vuu whose telephone number is (571) 270-1048.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on (571) 272-4847. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Henry Vuu

12/18/2006

BA HUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER